

Fair tonight; probably fair Saturday; temperature near freezing tonight; south-westerly winds, becoming variable; slowly rising temperature.

NO. 515.

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, MARCH 26, 1897—SIX PAGES.

YESTERDAY WAS

38,210

COPIES.

ONE CENT.

## SPRINGS A TARIFF SURPRISE

Lanham Moves to Strike Out Enacting Clause in the Bill.

## REPUBLICANS IN A MINORITY

Chairman Sherman Finally Ruled That the Motion Was Not in Order at That Time—Spurring Over an Amendment to Admit Free Any Article Controlled by a Trust.

The consideration of the schedules of the tariff bill in detail for the purpose of amendment was proceeded today by the recitation of the Lord's Prayer by Chaplain Couden.

The House went into committee of the whole, and the clerk was instructed to begin reading the bill.

Mr. Lanham of Texas asked if it would be in order at this time to move to strike out the enacting clause, which, he stated, if adopted, would operate as a rejection of the bill.

The motion created temporary consternation in the Republican ranks, for there was not a quorum of the committee present, and it was apparent that a larger number of Democrats were in their seats than Republicans.

Mr. Dingley, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, suggested that the motion be held in abeyance until some previous had been made in the reading of the bill, when there would be a larger attendance present. To press the motion now would result only in delaying consideration of the bill until a quorum could be obtained.

Mr. Lanham again stated that the motion expressed his antagonism to the bill, and he desired to press it to a vote now, the chairman having held it to be in order.

Chairman Sherman—the chair has made no ruling; it has only expressed a lusty opinion that the motion is in order. But the gentleman called the terms of the special order, under which the House is proceeding?

Mr. Lanham—I do not understand, Mr. Chairman, that that order supersedes the general rules governing debate and the consideration of the bill.

While the chairman was looking up the subject an animated colloquy progressed on the floor.

Mr. Dalzell called that gentleman on the other side had been clamoring for debate and they knew that the effect of the motion, if agreed to, would simply be to cut off the five-minute discussion. It seemed they did not want that discussion.

Mr. Dockery said there was a precedent for the motion. In the Forty-eighth Congress a Representative from Ohio had moved to strike out the enacting clause of a tariff bill.

Mr. Payne—But the gentleman must remember that that was a motion by a Democrat to enunciate a Democratic measure.

Chairman Sherman ruled that under the special order the motion by the gentleman from Texas was not then in order.

Mr. Lanham—Will the chair kindly inform me at what stage of the proceedings it will be in order? When there shall be a full attendance of members?

Chairman Sherman—When the gentleman proposes the motion again, the chair will rule upon it. (Republican applause.)

When the introductory paragraph had been read, Mr. Dockery offered an amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury, when he should be satisfied that any article on the tariff list was being manufactured and its production and price controlled by a trust in the United States, then he should admit the article to the United States free of duty.

To this Mr. Dingley made the point of order that the amendment related to the free list, and that had not yet been reached.

Mr. Dalzell made the further point that Congress could not confer such power on the Secretary of the Treasury; and in answer to questions stated that no such power was conferred by the bill upon the President in respect of the reciprocity features.

Mr. Cooper suggested a substitute for Mr. Dockery's amendment, conferring the power upon the President, which Mr. Dockery said he was perfectly willing to accept. It would mean the objection of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Dalzell—It does not meet it at all.

Mr. Richardson—Then the objection cannot be met and the gentleman does not want it met.

Mr. Dockery said he did not want the amendment while having in mind the authority and power conferred by the nineteenth section of the bill upon the Secretary of the Treasury to suspend the prohibition against the importation of meat and hides into the United States under certain conditions.

The point of order was further discussed by Messrs. Richardson, McKee, Tawney, Bailey, and Dalzell, in which Mr. Richardson said he feared that the objection of some members to the amendment was that they desired to protect trusts. They were willing by the terms of the bill to give the power to the Secretary of the Treasury in respect to cattle, but not as to human beings. As for himself, between cattle and men, he was for the latter. (Applause.)

Mr. Tawney asked Mr. Richardson if he was so anxious for this legislation why he did not seek to incorporate it in the law of 1894.

Mr. Richardson replied that a study of the Wilson bill, in his opinion, would discover the existence of a provision very similar to the proposition of Mr. Dockery.

Mr. Tawney—That's still on the statute book, then?

Mr. Richardson—But you proposed to repeal it by this bill.

Mr. Dingley, Mr. Tawney, Mr. Dalzell and others—Oh, no, not at all.

Mr. Richardson—Then what is the objection to putting it into this bill? I never heard more insistent objections made on this floor to a proper proposition. First, you say it cannot be done at all; that Congress has no power to give the President or Secretary the power sought, and then next moment declare it to be the law already. (Democratic applause.)

Mr. Bailey argued that the amendment was in order at this point, referring in support of his opinion to a decision in the Forty-fifth Congress that an amendment need not be germane to the paragraph or section to which it was offered, but must be germane to the general provisions of the measure. On this general question of trusts Mr. Bailey said if the Republicans would add the Democrats in their efforts to protect the people from trusts he would guarantee them an opportunity to vote.

Mr. Hepburn claimed the amendment was not only germane to the bill, but absolutely destructive of its purpose. (Democratic laughter.)

"Don't laugh yet," Mr. Hepburn said. "There is the sugar schedule, from which we expect to raise fifty millions of revenue. Five men on the other side may form a combination, and without intending to do so, control the price of sugar, thereby compelling the Secretary of the Treasury to put that article on the free list. And so with regard to wool, free traders thinking it should go on the free list, might easily form a sham trust to control the price of that article and by compelling it to be placed on the free list, destroy that industry."

Mr. Bailey returned Mr. Hepburn's thanks to the gentleman from Iowa for his frankness in admitting that his objections to "our efforts to destroy trusts are that they will interfere with the objects of the bill." (Democratic applause.)

## WAR FOR WAR'S SAKE ONLY

Ex-Minister for the Colonies Attacks the Spanish Cabinet.

## A FRIEND OF CUBA SPEAKS

Senor Canovas Accused by a Former Cabinet Minister of Publishing Cabinet Reforms Which He Does Not Intend to Establish—Genuine Concessions Wanted by Cubans.

Havana, March 26.—A dispatch from Madrid, by way of Key West, has been received here by the political friends of the Spanish ex-minister of the colonies, Senor Don Antonio Maura, in which news is given of a sensational speech by Senor Maura, in which he made very severe criticisms upon the Spanish cabinet and its colonial policy.

Senor Maura spoke at length of the situation in Cuba, the events that led up to the revolution, and the plan of reforms he proposed to the Cortes when he was minister of the colonies. He repelled with indignation the charge made against him by the conservative of Cuba that his plan was one of the causes which precipitated the war. On the contrary, said Senor Maura, a policy of wise concessions to the Cubans in 1894 would have averted the war; and those Cubans who were conspiring against Spain, in conjunction with Marti, in the United States, had an opportunity to promote an armed conflict only when the country had lost hopes of the fulfillment of such a policy by the government.

Senor Maura added that the cabinet of Senor Canovas obliges the nation to make war in Cuba only in support of a stubborn spirit of resistance to any liberal changes, and that "war for war's sake only" is one of the greatest blunders which can be made by any people. He accuses Senor Canovas of playing a disloyal trick upon Spain and Cuba by substituting a policy of reforms which he has no intention of establishing.

Senor Maura is still of the opinion that genuine and liberal concessions to Cuba will conquer the hearts of the Cuban people, and to put an end to the revolution; but the Spanish cabinet is not capable of achieving this great work. The Liberal party, on the other hand, will be able to effect by the present regime, save Spain from the many misfortunes in which Senor Canovas and his followers have involved her.

The speech of Senor Maura is said to have produced a great stir in Spain. In Havana it is much applauded by his friends of the Reformist party, though they dare not make any public comment, for fear of Gen. Weyler.

The latest news from Matanzas gives additional details of the work of devastation wrought by the Spanish column of Col. Molina. They have destroyed a great deal of property belonging to American citizens.

Stirring details have been received of the attack made a few days ago by the insurgents on the town of Paredes, in the jurisdiction of Sancti Spiritus. A Spaniard who witnessed the engagement said that the insurgents surrounded the Casariego fort, rushed up close to its walls, thrust their rifles through the port holes and fired repeatedly upon the garrison inside.

It was a hand-to-hand fight, both parties often seizing in their hands the weapons of their enemies. Nearly all the wounded suffered were mortal. The Spanish commander, Capt. Buerbas, was wounded and disabled, did not yield, because they were protected by the fire of the neighboring Fort Fiel. Upon observing this the insurgents attacked Fort Fiel with the same reckless courage and after a hot struggle succeeded in breaking down the door. They then entered and killed all the garrison except one soldier, whom they took prisoner. After that they entered the town, burned many houses and ransacked several stores. The losses on both sides were heavy and both showed the greatest courage throughout the fight. The Spaniards were more advantageous, as they fought inside the forts.

Mr. Newlands said he disagreed with the Democrats as to need of revenue, and as to parsimony in administration of the Government. He was in favor of the bill so far as the purpose of supplying more money was concerned, though it did not give protection equally. But there were trusts and trusts, and some of them were made necessary by others. He was in favor of making the first attack upon the father of all trusts, the money trust.

Mr. Dalzell called attention to the clause of the Dingley bill which says, "unless otherwise specially provided," and said it was put there to allow this very kind of amendment.

He disagreed with Mr. Newlands as to the purpose and effect of the bill. There was no aim in it to maintain or raise prices. The whole purpose of the Republican party, as shown by their talk and course in the late campaign, is to keep prices down.

Mr. Roy said the Wilson bill showed that the Democrats were too ignorant of the subject of tariff to give any valuable assistance. He advised that no attention be paid them.

Mr. Tawney, of Minnesota, claimed that the efforts of the opposition in behalf of the amendment were merely intended to make a little cheap political capital. He read the record of the vote of the Democratic Representatives against the Sherman anti-trust law of 1890.

Mr. Richardson asked if there had ever been a conviction under that measure, and Mr. Tawney, replying, called attention to the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States upholding a conviction under the law.

Mr. Richardson asked Mr. Tawney if he meant to charge that the Democrats who had named, including Mr. Rand, were opposed to the bill. Mr. Tawney parried the question three or four times, but finally said that opposition to the bill was the only inference from the vote against consideration.

Mr. Richardson then read from the Record showing that Mr. Rand, in opposing consideration, said he was not opposed to the bill, and said in that Mr. Rand spoke for all Democrats, for he was the leader.

The Democrats merely wanted to legislate for silver and the Republicans were opposing this bill.

Mr. McMillin had the Record further read showing that every Representative voting voted for the anti-trust law.

Mr. Dalzell asked if it were not a fact that the Democrats were simply dodging when they wanted to take up the silver bill. They voted for the anti-trust law when snatched into the open, but tried to get away from it.

Mr. McMillin insisted that their purpose was sincere to legislate for silver.

"We prevented you," said Mr. Dalzell, "and you prevented us now."

"Yes," exclaimed Mr. McMillin, "and you'll get your political death by it."

Mr. Henderson had a little colloquy with Mr. Rand as to which was the demagogue, and each was cheered by his own party, so that the whole House, for a rarity, was applauding at once.

Dr. Nansen and the Fram.

London, March 6.—The Daily News says that Dr. Nansen, the arctic explorer, will lead the Fram, the vessel in which he made his journey to the far north, to a prime arctic expedition that will start during the coming summer. He will also give advice to the members of the expedition. The expedition will be mainly English, and its purpose will be meteorological observations and an examination of the arctic currents.

Next Nails, per kg., 100 lbs., \$1.00. Libby & Co., 6th st. and New York ave. at

Libby & Co., 6th st. and New York ave. at

Libby & Co., 6th st. and New York ave. at

Libby & Co., 6th st. and New York ave. at

Libby & Co., 6th st. and New York ave. at

Libby & Co., 6th st. and New York ave. at

Libby & Co., 6th st. and New York ave. at

## WAR FOR WAR'S SAKE ONLY

Ex-Minister for the Colonies Attacks the Spanish Cabinet.

## A FRIEND OF CUBA SPEAKS

Senor Canovas Accused by a Former Cabinet Minister of Publishing Cabinet Reforms Which He Does Not Intend to Establish—Genuine Concessions Wanted by Cubans.

Havana, March 26.—A dispatch from Madrid, by way of Key West, has been received here by the political friends of the Spanish ex-minister of the colonies, Senor Don Antonio Maura, in which news is given of a sensational speech by Senor Maura, in which he made very severe criticisms upon the Spanish cabinet and its colonial policy.

Senor Maura spoke at length of the situation in Cuba, the events that led up to the revolution, and the plan of reforms he proposed to the Cortes when he was minister of the colonies. He repelled with indignation the charge made against him by the conservative of Cuba that his plan was one of the causes which precipitated the war. On the contrary, said Senor Maura, a policy of wise concessions to the Cubans in 1894 would have averted the war; and those Cubans who were conspiring against Spain, in conjunction with Marti, in the United States, had an opportunity to promote an armed conflict only when the country had lost hopes of the fulfillment of such a policy by the government.

Senor Maura added that the cabinet of Senor Canovas obliges the nation to make war in Cuba only in support of a stubborn spirit of resistance to any liberal changes, and that "war for war's sake only" is one of the greatest blunders which can be made by any people. He accuses Senor Canovas of playing a disloyal trick upon Spain and Cuba by substituting a policy of reforms which he has no intention of establishing.

Senor Maura is still of the opinion that genuine and liberal concessions to Cuba will conquer the hearts of the Cuban people, and to put an end to the revolution; but the Spanish cabinet is not capable of achieving this great work. The Liberal party, on the other hand, will be able to effect by the present regime, save Spain from the many misfortunes in which Senor Canovas and his followers have involved her.

The speech of Senor Maura is said to have produced a great stir in Spain. In Havana it is much applauded by his friends of the Reformist party, though they dare not make any public comment, for fear of Gen. Weyler.

The latest news from Matanzas gives additional details of the work of devastation wrought by the Spanish column of Col. Molina. They have destroyed a great deal of property belonging to American citizens.

Stirring details have been received of the attack made a few days ago by the insurgents on the town of Paredes, in the jurisdiction of Sancti Spiritus. A Spaniard who witnessed the engagement said that the insurgents surrounded the Casariego fort, rushed up close to its walls, thrust their rifles through the port holes and fired repeatedly upon the garrison inside.

It was a hand-to-hand fight, both parties often seizing in their hands the weapons of their enemies. Nearly all the wounded suffered were mortal. The Spanish commander, Capt. Buerbas, was wounded and disabled, did not yield, because they were protected by the fire of the neighboring Fort Fiel. Upon observing this the insurgents attacked Fort Fiel with the same reckless courage and after a hot struggle succeeded in breaking down the door. They then entered and killed all the garrison except one soldier, whom they took prisoner. After that they entered the town, burned many houses and ransacked several stores. The losses on both sides were heavy and both showed the greatest courage throughout the fight. The Spaniards were more advantageous, as they fought inside the forts.

Mr. Newlands said he disagreed with the Democrats as to need of revenue, and as to parsimony in administration of the Government. He was in favor of the bill so far as the purpose of supplying more money was concerned, though it did not give protection equally. But there were trusts and trusts, and some of them were made necessary by others. He was in favor of making the first attack upon the father of all trusts, the money trust.

Mr. Dalzell called attention to the clause of the Dingley bill which says, "unless otherwise specially provided," and said it was put there to allow this very kind of amendment.

He disagreed with Mr. Newlands as to the purpose and effect of the bill. There was no aim in it to maintain or raise prices. The whole purpose of the Republican party, as shown by their talk and course in the late campaign, is to keep prices down.

Mr. Roy said the Wilson bill showed that the Democrats were too ignorant of the subject of tariff to give any valuable assistance. He advised that no attention be paid them.

Mr. Tawney, of Minnesota, claimed that the efforts of the opposition in behalf of the amendment were merely intended to make a little cheap political capital. He read the record of the vote of the Democratic Representatives against the Sherman anti-trust law of 1890.

Mr. Richardson asked if there had ever been a conviction under that measure, and Mr. Tawney, replying, called attention to the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States upholding a conviction under the law.

Mr. Richardson asked Mr. Tawney if he meant to charge that the Democrats who had named, including Mr. Rand, were opposed to the bill. Mr. Tawney parried the question three or four times, but finally said that opposition to the bill was the only inference from the vote against consideration.

Mr. Richardson then read from the Record showing that Mr. Rand, in opposing consideration, said he was not opposed to the bill, and said in that Mr. Rand spoke for all Democrats, for he was the leader.

The Democrats merely wanted to legislate for silver and the Republicans were opposing this bill.

Mr. McMillin had the Record further read showing that every Representative voting voted for the anti-trust law.

Mr. Dalzell asked if it were not a fact that the Democrats were simply dodging when they wanted to take up the silver bill. They voted for the anti-trust law when snatched into the open, but tried to get away from it.

Mr. McMillin insisted that their purpose was sincere to legislate for silver.

"We prevented you," said Mr. Dalzell, "and you prevented us now."

"Yes," exclaimed Mr. McMillin, "and you'll get your political death by it."

Mr. Henderson had a little colloquy with Mr. Rand as to which was the demagogue, and each was cheered by his own party, so that the whole House, for a rarity, was applauding at once.

Dr. Nansen and the Fram.

London, March 6.—The Daily News says that Dr. Nansen, the arctic explorer, will lead the Fram, the vessel in which he made his journey to the far north, to a prime arctic expedition that will start during the coming summer. He will also give advice to the members of the expedition. The expedition will be mainly English, and its purpose will be meteorological observations and an examination of the arctic currents.

Next Nails, per kg., 100 lbs., \$1.00. Libby & Co., 6th st. and New York ave. at

Libby & Co., 6th st. and New York ave. at

Libby & Co., 6th st. and New York ave. at

Libby & Co., 6th st. and New York ave. at

Libby & Co., 6th st. and New York ave. at

Libby & Co., 6th st. and New York ave. at

Libby & Co., 6th st. and New York ave. at

## BRYAN APPROVES THE RULING.

But Recalls a Former Railroad Decision That Was Ineffective.

## STATE PAPERS DISAPPEAR

It Is Claimed They Were Taken by President Cleveland.

Important Public Documents Are Missing From the White House. No Trace Can Be Found of the Spotted Charges—May Cause Delay in Presidential Action.

New York, March 26.—The Journal to-day publishes the following dispatch from Washington:

During a lull between pushes of office-seekers this week the Administration made a discovery that was rather surprising, but which confirmed an suspicion which it may have had that the retiring President was a law unto himself and that he had carefully removed all evidence of a political nature which had accumulated in the files of the Executive Mansion.

He had, moreover, drawn a wide line as to what constituted political documents.

An effort was made by one of the clerks to look up a case pertaining to an administrative officer who is still in the service, and against whom certain damaging official charges had been filed, when it was discovered that all of the papers had been removed. Inquiry was made, which developed the fact that President Cleveland, three or four days before retiring from office, had carefully collected what documents he wanted from the files, and ordered them securely tied up and boxed and then shipped them to Princeton.

It appears that Mr. Cleveland has taken liberal license in determining which of the documents on file were private and which were public. Naturally an outgoing President is sufficiently cautious to destroy or remove all papers of a purely political nature which may give an unfriendly successor an opportunity to damage him in the eyes of his followers.

For instance, in endeavoring to fill up the public offices with his personal friends, preparatory to extending the civil service rules, Mr. Cleveland may have entered into voluminous correspondence with such a nature that its publication would have produced him a hypocrite. He had a clear privilege, therefore, to consider such documents private property, and remove them from the files in the Executive Mansion.

There are certain matters, however, that remained unacted upon—pension-bills, for instance. Now it is reported that Mr. Cleveland may have entered into voluminous correspondence with such a nature that its publication would have produced him a hypocrite. He had a clear privilege, therefore, to consider such documents private property, and remove them from the files in the Executive Mansion.

There are certain matters, however, that remained unacted upon—pension-bills, for instance. Now it is reported that Mr. Cleveland may have entered into voluminous correspondence with such a nature that its publication would have produced him a hypocrite. He had a clear privilege, therefore, to consider such documents private property, and remove them from the files in the Executive Mansion.

There are certain matters, however, that remained unacted upon—pension-bills, for instance. Now it is reported that Mr. Cleveland may have entered into voluminous correspondence with such a nature that its publication would have produced him a hypocrite. He had a clear privilege, therefore, to consider such documents private property, and remove them from the files in the Executive Mansion.

There are certain matters, however, that remained unacted upon—pension-bills, for instance. Now it is reported that Mr. Cleveland may have entered into voluminous correspondence with such a nature that its publication would have produced him a hypocrite. He had a clear privilege, therefore, to consider such documents private property, and remove them from the files in the Executive Mansion.

There are certain matters, however, that remained unacted upon—pension-bills, for instance. Now it is reported that Mr. Cleveland may have entered into voluminous correspondence with such a nature that its publication would have produced him a hypocrite. He had a clear privilege, therefore, to consider such documents private property, and remove them from the files in the Executive Mansion.

There are certain matters, however, that remained unacted upon—pension-bills, for instance. Now it is reported that Mr. Cleveland may have entered into voluminous correspondence with such a nature that its publication would have produced him a hypocrite. He had a clear privilege, therefore, to consider such documents private property, and remove them from the files in the Executive Mansion.

There are certain matters, however, that remained unacted upon—pension-bills, for instance. Now it is reported that Mr. Cleveland may have entered into voluminous correspondence with such a nature that its publication would have produced him a hypocrite. He had a clear privilege, therefore, to consider such documents private property, and remove them from the files in the Executive Mansion.

There are certain matters, however, that remained unacted upon—pension-bills, for instance. Now it is reported that Mr. Cleveland may have entered into voluminous correspondence with such a nature that its publication would have produced him a hypocrite. He had a clear privilege, therefore, to consider such documents private property, and remove them from the files in the Executive Mansion.

There are certain matters, however, that remained unacted upon—pension-bills, for instance. Now it is reported that Mr. Cleveland may have entered into voluminous correspondence with such a nature that its publication would have produced him a hypocrite. He had a clear privilege, therefore, to consider such documents private property, and remove them from the files in the Executive Mansion.

There are certain matters, however, that remained unacted upon—pension-bills, for instance. Now it is reported that Mr. Cleveland may have entered into voluminous correspondence with such a nature that its publication would have produced him a hypocrite. He had a clear privilege, therefore, to consider such documents private property, and remove them from the files in the Executive Mansion.

There are certain matters, however, that remained unacted upon—pension-bills, for instance. Now it is reported that Mr. Cleveland may have entered into voluminous correspondence with such a nature that its publication would have produced him a hypocrite. He had a clear privilege, therefore, to consider such documents private property, and remove them from the files in the Executive Mansion.

There are certain matters, however, that remained unacted upon—pension-bills, for instance. Now it is reported that Mr. Cleveland may have entered into voluminous correspondence with such a nature that its publication would have produced him a hypocrite. He had a clear privilege, therefore, to consider such documents private property, and remove them from the files in the Executive Mansion.

There are certain matters, however, that remained unacted upon—pension-bills, for instance. Now it is reported that Mr. Cleveland may have entered into voluminous correspondence with such a nature that its publication would have produced him a hypocrite. He had a clear privilege, therefore, to consider such documents private property, and remove them from the files in the Executive Mansion.

There are certain matters, however, that remained unacted upon—pension-bills, for instance. Now it is reported that Mr. Cleveland may have entered into voluminous correspondence with such a nature that its publication would have produced him a hypocrite. He had a clear privilege, therefore, to consider such documents private property, and remove them from the files in the Executive Mansion.

There are certain matters, however, that remained unacted upon—pension-bills, for instance. Now it is reported that Mr. Cleveland may have entered into voluminous correspondence with such a nature that its publication would have produced him a hypocrite. He had a clear privilege, therefore, to consider such documents private property, and remove them from the files in the Executive Mansion.

There are certain matters, however, that remained unacted upon—pension-bills, for instance. Now it is reported that Mr. Cleveland may have entered into voluminous correspondence with such a nature that its publication would have produced him a hypocrite. He had a clear privilege, therefore, to consider such documents private property, and remove them from the files in the Executive Mansion.

There are certain matters, however, that remained unacted upon—pension-bills, for instance. Now it is reported that Mr. Cleveland may have entered into voluminous correspondence with such a nature that its publication would have produced him a hypocrite. He had a clear privilege, therefore, to consider such documents private property, and remove them from the files in the Executive Mansion.

There are certain matters, however, that remained unacted upon—pension-bills, for instance. Now it is reported that Mr. Cleveland may have entered into voluminous correspondence with such a nature that its publication would have produced him a hypocrite. He had a clear privilege, therefore, to consider such documents private property, and remove them from the files in the Executive Mansion.

There are certain matters, however, that remained unacted upon—pension-bills, for instance. Now it is reported that Mr. Cleveland may have entered into voluminous correspondence with such a nature that its publication would have produced him a hypocrite. He had a clear privilege, therefore, to consider such documents private property, and remove them from the files in the Executive Mansion.

There are certain matters, however, that remained unacted upon—pension-bills, for instance. Now it is reported that Mr. Cleveland may have entered into voluminous correspondence with such a nature that its publication would have produced him a hypocrite. He had a clear privilege, therefore, to consider such documents private property, and remove them from the files in the Executive Mansion.

There are certain matters, however, that remained unacted upon—pension-bills, for instance. Now it is reported that Mr. Cleveland may have entered into voluminous correspondence with such a nature that its publication would have produced him a hypocrite. He had a clear privilege, therefore, to consider such documents private property, and remove them from the files in the Executive Mansion.

There are certain matters, however, that remained unacted upon—pension-bills, for instance. Now it is reported that Mr. Cleveland may have entered into voluminous correspondence with such a nature that its publication would have produced him a hypocrite. He had a clear privilege, therefore, to consider such documents private property, and remove them from the files in the Executive Mansion.

There are certain matters, however, that remained unacted upon—pension-bills, for instance. Now it is reported that Mr. Cleveland may have entered into voluminous correspondence with such a nature that its publication would have produced him a hypocrite. He had a clear privilege, therefore, to consider such documents private property, and remove them from the files in the Executive Mansion.

There are certain matters, however, that remained unacted upon—pension-bills, for instance. Now it is reported that Mr. Cleveland may have entered into voluminous correspondence with such a nature that its publication would have produced him a hypocrite. He had a clear privilege, therefore, to consider such documents private property, and remove them from the files in the Executive Mansion.

There are certain matters, however, that remained unacted upon—pension-bills, for instance. Now it is reported that Mr. Cleveland may have entered into voluminous correspondence with such a nature that its publication would have produced him a hypocrite. He had a clear privilege, therefore, to consider such documents private property, and remove them from the files in the Executive Mansion.

## STATE PAPERS DISAPPEAR

It Is Claimed They Were Taken by President Cleveland.

## SHIPPED THEM TO PRINCETON

Important Public Documents Are Missing From the White House. No Trace Can Be Found of the Spotted Charges—May Cause Delay in Presidential Action.

New York, March 26.—The Journal to-day publishes the following dispatch from Washington:

During a lull between pushes of office-seekers this week the Administration made a discovery that was rather surprising, but which confirmed an suspicion which it may have had that the retiring President was a law unto himself and that he had carefully removed all evidence of a political nature which had accumulated in the files of the Executive Mansion.

He had, moreover, drawn a wide line as to what constituted political documents.